(2)

PROGRESS OF THE REGIMENT:

A FRAMEWORK FOR UNDERSTANDING STEPHEN CRANE'S THE RED BADGE OF COURAGE

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of English

The College of William and Mary in Virginia

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

---

by

Captain Timothy Brotherton

1990

APPROVAL SHEET

This thesis is submitted in partial fulfillment of

the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Timothy J. Brotherton

Approved, July 1990

Elsa Nettels

Elsa Nettels

Christopher MacGowan

Richard Lowry

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation to Professor Elsa Nettels for showing how my personal (and rewarding) experiences with American soldiers could connect with my literary investigations. I also appreciate the dedication and hard work of the essay's other two readers, Christopher MacGowan and Richard Lowry. And to Megan and Sandy, who showed me that the playground, the swing set and the sandbox, are just as important to a Dad's education as they are to a child's. They reminded me that writing is most important when it connects with a real life --that literature and history are useful only in the context of our lives.

STATEMENT "A" per Capt. Timothy Brothertor
Dept. Of English
West Point, NY 10996-1779
TELECON 8/27/90 VG

ABSTRACT

At the center of both the novel and the scholarship of Stephen Crane's The Red Badge of Courage is the characterization of the protagonist Henry Fleming. Until the 1960's most critics assumed that Henry matured, at least to some degree, and described the novel as a story of individual growth and initiation. More recently an increasing number of critics have found Henry's thoughts and actions to be consistently ironic and self-deluded. My discussion approaches Henry's maturity from a structural perspective.

Several scholars are concerned about elements of the novel which have been overlooked because of this critical concentration on either Henry Fleming or the novel's imagery. This has resulted in neglect for "significant aspects of the form and technique" says Donald Pizer.

This study will investigate one of these considerations of form: how Henry's regiment serves as a major plot element, one that drives the forward action of the novel. The regiment is ever-present, either physically or at the center of Henry's thoughts (and self rationalizations), it is one of the structural frames around which the novel is constructed. Henry's membership, as a green recruit in a newly formed and untried regiment, led by untested officers, is at the crux of his experiences. During the two days of fighting, the regiment and many of its individuals mature rapidly. The regiment's progression, reflected by the development of Henry's comrades, their regiment and its officers, demonstrates that Henry's development is not just ironic self-delusion, but a realistic presentation of social consciousness and personal maturity. Theses. (cp)

PROGRESS OF THE REGIMENT:

A FRAMEWORK FOR UNDERSTANDING STEPHEN CRANE'S

THE RED BADGE OF COURAGE

For the soldiers of the Eleventh U.S. Corps, behind the main Federal positions at Chancellorsville, the first warning of "Stonewall" Jackson's rear attack came not from the Confederate lines, says Corps Commander General Oliver Howard, but when "like a cloud of dust driven before a spring shower appeared the startled rabbits, squirrels, quail and other game flying wildly hither and thither in evident terror." They were followed, narrates Harry Hansen in his book The Civil War, by the gray coated Confederates, who crashed out of the woods everywhere and with "that screech known as the rebel yell" crushed the extended lines (308). These are probably the most significant moments of the battle of Chancellorsville. And it is at Chancellorsville that Stephen Crane places the protagonist of his The Red Badge of Courage, Henry Fleming, to confront his fear of the red swollen face of battle, and to receive his "red badge of courage." [1]

How well Henry faces this test of courage remains a major concern for the scholars of Crane's novel. Critics have long argued over the difficulty of knowing what Crane's relationship is to his protagonist at the novel's close. Is the youth's estimate of himself as a "man" accurate, or is it just another ironic depiction of his own self-delusion? Or is Crane's characterization of Henry "consciously or unconsciously ambivalent?" [2] Some critics believe that Henry does mature, at least to some degree; they find the novel one of individual growth and initiation. But recently most critics have concluded that Henry's thoughts and actions are consistently ironic and self-deluded. [3]

Donald Pizer, in his article "Crane: A Guide to Criticism," reviews some of the shortcomings of the novel's scholarship. He argues that a neglected aspect of The Red Badge of Courage is an analysis of the overall structure of the novel.

> A good many of the significant aspects of the form and technique of The Red Badge of Courage have either been totally neglected or only tentatively sketched, perhaps because critical preoccupation with the imagery of the novel has obscured the need to examine other formalistic problems. (156)

One structural frame of The Red Badge of Courage is the military organizations to which Henry belongs. It is impossible to separate an individual's experience from the context of his unit's forward progression. The unit's progression serves in turn to mirror the individual's growth and maturity. At the heart of Henry's experiences in his "various battles" as a green recruit is his participation as a member of a newly formed and untried regiment, led by untested officers. Attention to the progression of the regiment, illustrated by the progression of both the individual members and the corporate whole, demonstrates that Henry's development is not just a portrait of ironic self-delusion, but a convincing presentation of social consciousness and personal maturity.

I

Many implications of the regiment's progression are made explicit in the proposed sources of The Red Badge of Courage. Because Crane was so young (and had not seen war), searching for what might have influenced him has been a major element of Crane scholarship. Pizer says that this search for literary sources was a once "active field" which had the intention of establishing a "major source" for the novel (151). Early studies proposed European writers as the dominat influence for the work. For example Lars Ahnebrink cited similarities to Emile Zola's La Debacle and to Leo Tolstoy's Sebastopol Sketches. [4]

But most critics have looked towards Civil War novels as the major source for The Red Badge. One of the earliest, and influential essays of this type is H.T. Webster's "William F. Hinman's Corporal Si Klegg and Stephen Crane's The Red Badge of Courage." Webster argues that "nearly everything that makes up The Red Badge of Courage exists at least in germ" (286) in Hinman's novel, Corporal Si Klegg and His Pard (1887). In both novels the protagonists are green recruits who enlist in new regiments against parental wishes, because of patriotic rhetoric. Both are prone to romantic "self-

dramatization" (Webster 286) and develop from raw farm boys to hardened veterans through field experiences. Both men are anxious about their personal courage, both are proven in battle by seizing a flag from a falling color bearer, and both are praised for heroism by their colonels. [5] At first look these were persuasive plot parallels, until, as Wertheim shows, the novel had significant plot similarities to many other Civil War novels (61-2). Eric Solomon argues that Joseph Kirkland's The Captain of CompanyK is an analogue of The Red Badge of Courage, while Thomas O'Donnell makes a case for John William De Forest's novel Miss Ravenel's Conversion (featuring gritty realism in its battle scenes). [6] While in each case there are impressive parallels, there is no proof that Crane read any of these novels. There are also a number of "personal narratives" or memoirs of Union army veterans which contain similar parallels to the fictional accounts.

Stanley Wertheim notes, in his essay "The Red Badge of Courage and Personal Narratives of the Civil War," that "narrative reminiscences" by Union veterans were published with increasing frequency in the 1870's and 1880's. He characterizes these personal chronicles as "semi-fictional but graphically realistic, that traced the adventures of a young recruit from the time of his enlistment through his battle experiences, usually as a member of a particular brigade or regiment" (61 my emphasis). Wertheim's main concern is the lack of critical recognition of a "distinctive literary convention for Civil War narratives, embodied in literally dozens of exemplars," which was "established during Crane's formative years" and which he "must have been thoroughly familiar with" (61). Wertheim contends that Crane "originally conceived of The Red Badge as an outgrowth of this genre" [of personal narratives] (61).

Wertheim's discussion of these personal narratives provides evidence that Crane incorporated the "autobiographical" tradition of these memoirs into his novel. Several of Wertheim's examples, such as Alonzo F. Hill's Our Boys: The Personal Experience of a

Soldier in the Army of the Potomac (1864), contain at least as many similarities to The Red Badge as Corporal Si Klegg. [7]

The common elements of these personal narratives which are also found in the major plot elements of Crane's novel include: patriotic fervor as a cause to enlist, heroic fantasies of war, parental opposition to the enlistment, doubts about personal courage, anxiety over the confusion and purposelessness of troop movements, denunciation of field officers, ghastly sights of the dead or dreadful processions of the wounded, and officer's use of swords to keep the men in the firing lines. [8] According to Wertheim these "chronicles" usually involved the "maturation theme of a recruit into veteran through an entire military campaign of a regiment or brigade" (64 my emphasis).

Wertheim's thesis is echoed by Daniel Aaron's The Unwritten War: American Writers and the Civil War. Both suggest that Crane was drawing not from a single source, but from a genre of narratives which showed the experiences of a Civil War recruit. Pizer agrees, observing that the tendency today in The Red Badge criticism is to "deemphasize the importance of sources." Yet it is useful, he says, to "acknowledge the ...different threads of influence without stressing one or the other" (151). Like Wertheim and Aaron, Pizer believes that there were "enough unromanticized portrayals of the trials of the recruit in Civil War personal narratives, art, and photography to supply a foundation for Crane's own rejection of the conventions of the popular Civil War romance" ("Review of Scholarship" 136).

From this it seems likely that Crane drew many of his plot elements from Civil War narratives. Since there are so many plot elements in common between these narratives, both fictional and non-fictional, it seems counterproductive to attempt to isolate a single major source. Perhaps it was the very frequency of appearance of some of these situations that appealed to Crane, as a method of insuring a gripping portrayal of something he had not personally experienced. For my purposes, the most important of these common plot

elements is the association of the recruit's experience with that of his equally inexperienced comrades, their regiment and officers. From the unusually large number of examples in which individuals mature in the context of a unit, it appears that this theme is, to a degree, a formula of Civil War narration.

II

The importance of his unit to Henry's development and safety is first mentioned by his mother. Instead of supporting his romantic misconceptions of war as a "Greek-like struggle," she undercuts his notions of individual "prowess" (7).

> "You watch out, Henry, an' take good care of yerself in this here fighting business- .... Don't go a-thinkin' you can lick the hull rebel army at the start, because yeh can't. Yer jest one little feller amongst a hull lot of others, and yeh've got to keep quiet an' do what they tell yeh." (8)

While she "doggedly peeled potatoes," she continues "that yeh must never do no shirking" and "don't think of anything 'cept what's right" (9). Her speech, irritating to him, reinforces the importance of the group over the individual for their mutual protection. The romantic notions of war must be put aside for the realities of combat in the gunpowder age. Warren Anderson, in his discussion of "Homer and Stephen Crane," argues that the "novel as a whole provides an extended refutation" of Henry's romantic illusions (83), of individual "throat-grappling," full of glory, battles "extravagant in color, lurid with breathless deeds" (Red Badge 7). Anderson believes that the days of individual (Epic-like) heroics have passed, and that Henry will be in "an infantry battle where men must stand together against the enemy. The group effort counts for everything, and selflessness-... has become the highest virtue" (84). [9]

Henry initially has only an imperfect understanding of this requirement of unit integrity and discipline which promotes the common good. In his first two skirmishes he feels the pressure both from his personal illusions about "individual" battle, and from the requirements of the unit for corporate unity and discipline. One of his illusions is the

dehumanization of the enemy and war. His earliest impressions of battle are captured by a personification of the enemy and combat as a mechanized process. Just before Henry runs from the firing line, he begins to "exaggerate the endurance, the skill, and the valor of those who were coming." He thought "they must be machines of steel" (36). Later, just before joining the column of wounded, Henry is drawn towards the front. "The battle was like the grinding of an immense and terrible machine to him.... [the] grim processes, fascinated him. He must go close and see it produce corpses" (43). It is not by chance that the best infantry units have always been characterized by their machine-like precision in drill. Many armies have been victorious (and therefore effective at saving their own lives) by the superiority of their battle drills. [10] Unity, discipline, and precision of tactics are critical to success. Initially Henry recognizes this trait in the enemy, but not its importance to him personally.

A function of Henry's inability to understand the role of discipline and unit integrity can be found in his belonging to a green, inexperienced organization. Joseph Conrad explains that the importance of Henry's regiment being an untried unit is that it cannot immediately teach him the importance of discipline and teamwork.

> Stephen Crane places his Young Soldier in an untried regiment. And this is well contrived.... In order that the revelation should be complete, the Young Soldier has to be deprived of moral support which he would have found in a tried body of men matured in achievement to the consciousness of its worth. (192)

It is important, then, that Henry is placed in an untried unit so that the individual can mirror the experience of the group and vice versa. Historical accuracy is another reason to put the protagonist in an untried regiment. Unlike the Southern armies who integrated their replacements into veteran organizations to maintain similar structures and personnel fill rates, the Army of the Potomac did not replace losses from its regiments--they recruited new regiments (all green) and assigned them to Brigades/Divisions which were under strength. As a result "veteran regiments... were likely to be very small aggregations of men" (20). In The Red Badge, when one regiment sees the 304th New

York they ask: "Hey fellers, what brigade is that?" When told that it was one regiment, not a brigade (of 2 to 6 regiments) they "laughed, and said, 'O Gawd!'" (20). While Henry is considering his ability under fire, the veteran regiments are questioning the ability of the large (but ineffective) fresh regiment with so many new recruits. As Wertheim's autobiographical narratives indicate, there is an implicit correlation between the effectiveness of the individuals and the effectiveness of the unit. By placing Henry in an untried regiment, Crane can create a parallel experience between the progression of the individuals and their organization.

Reinforcing this correspondence between an untried unit and its individual soldiers are a number of associations that the narrator and members of Henry's regiment make. After crossing the pontoon bridges the column stops. "Presently the army again sat down to think" and Henry stops too, considering "his theory of a blue demonstration" (21). The army is personified as a thinking man, and Henry is simultaneously linked to that same action. When the new regiment prepares to receive its first enemy attack, a general shows up, savagely telling the Regimental Commander twice: "You've got to hold 'em back!" while shaking his fist in the Colonel's face. The Colonel answers, stammering in agitation. Then after "scold[ing] like a wet parrot" the Colonel regards "his men in a highly resentful manner, as if he regretted above everything his association with them" (30). The General clearly identifies Colonel MacChesnay's "worth" with the regiment's ability to hold the attack back. And it is only possible for the Colonel to "regret" his association if he feels that same link between himself and the unit. The next day, when Lt Hasbrouck, new company commander, comments on Henry's wild fighting even after the enemy has disappeared, he says: "By heavens, if I had ten thousand wild cats like you I could tear th' stomach outa this war in less'n a week!" (81). The use of the first person pronoun is instructive. The accomplishments (and failures) of his company reflect directly on his personal worth.

Even Henry makes a direct correspondence between himself and how the unit should act. When he flees the enemy "machines of steel," the "onslaught of redoubtable dragons," he runs on "mingled with others. He dimly saw men on his right and on his left" and heard footsteps behind him. "He thought that all the regiment was fleeing" (36-7). When he rationalizes later that "he had proceeded according to very correct and commendable rules" and that his actions "had been full of strategy" then he reasons that all the others must have also done the intelligent thing, and fled. When he discovers that they stayed to fight, it was their "blind ignorance and stupidity" that had "betrayed him" (39-40). It is an automatic, almost unconscious association and linkage in his mind that if he and some of the new recruits should run, then naturally all of the corresponding new recruits in the regiment would also run. While this argument is motivated by Henry's self-rationalization for his desertion, it illustrates his belief that there should be a correspondence between the individual's actions and those of the corporate whole.

The maturation of an individual within the corporate body of his military organization is both a common and highly organic process. It is impossible to separate the individual from his context. Combat experience is based on group experiences. While combat can be very lonely, the soldier's development has its basis in his view of the group. An individual can only measure his performance against the experiences, seen or narrated, of other individuals and groups. The new soldier progresses at the same time that the unit is changing: new soldiers, new leaders, veterans returning, and new experiences and situations, all create an incalculable relationship of flux between the charting of the individual and the unit. This makes it impossible to separate the progress of individual soldiers without a discussion of the experiences of their unit, since that forms the foundation of the individual's understanding of battle.

The progress of a unit, in this case a regiment, to the eventual status of a veteran organization is of natural interest to a writer of realistic narratives. It is neither a swift nor easy process. It might take only a few skirmishes during one campaign-- but usually it will

encompass many battles. As Wertheim's study of personal narratives shows, the unit's progression offers a ready-made plot sequence for battlefield memoirs, an important plot formula. The military service is very disorienting, changes occur at an accelerated pace, and socialization of new members is both constant and unrelenting. Even a few months make a large difference in what each man knows about how the unit operates. Any veteran who remembers his first days will always do it with the hindsight of how little he knew or understood. Because of this, accounts of military service are normally going to contain a movement towards experience and understanding. All of the possible sources already listed (both fictional and more purely autobiographical), contain to some degree this process of maturation from recruit to veteran, both individually and within a unit that simultaneously improves.

In the regiment's first battle in Crane's novel, the predominant descriptions are naturally of Henry, but from them we can determine something about the regiment as a whole. His first skirmish gives Henry a brief taste of the importance of corporate unity within military organizations. He "work[ed] his weapon like an automatic affair." Losing "concern for himself.... he became not a man but a member." He feels "welded into a common personality which was dominated by a single desire" and could not flee any "more than a little finger can commit a revolution from a hand" (30). Henry feels "the subtle battle brotherhood more potent even than the cause for which they were fighting. It was a mysterious fraternity born of the smoke and danger of death." He is described as "at a task... like a carpenter." He is a member of a group, gathering support from the actions of the others in the group. "Following this came a red rage" (31). Then Crane describes the soldiers that Henry can see around him.

> There was a blare of heated rage mingled with a certain expression of intentness on all faces. Many of the men were making low-toned noises with their mouths, and these subdued cheers, snarls, imprecations, prayers, made a wild, barbaric song that went as an undercurrent of sound, strange, and chantlike with the resounding chords of the war march. (31)

It seems reasonable that the unit as a group feels the same, or at least experiences a feeling of "rage" similar to Henry's.

> There was a singular absence of heroic poses. The men bending and surging in their haste and rage were in every impossible attitude.... The flaps of the cartridge boxes were all unfastened, and bobbed idiotically with each movement. The rifles, once loaded, were jerked to the shoulder and fired without aim into the smoke or at one of the blurred and shifting forms. (32)

These comments are impossible to attribute only to the narrator-- they could be seen and filtered by Henry's own feelings-- yet it seems very likely that the other soldiers feel a similar bond of brotherhood, "working at task" as a "member." They are part of the regiment which "was like a firework" which when "once ignited, proceeds superior to circumstances until its blazing vitality fades. It wheezed and banged with a mighty power" (31). Once the enemy skirmish line is driven back, "an exultant yell went along the quivering line.... Some in the regiment began to whoop frenziedly" (32-3). There are sociable greetings and handshakes, and exuberance and self-satisfaction. Again, the men he had known had features which "were familiar, but with whom the youth now felt the bonds of tied hearts" (34).

Immediately the enemy reforms to attack again. As the regiment prepares for the next fight, Crane personifies the organization as a body: "The sore joints of the regiment creaked as it painfully floundered into position to repulse" (35). The firing starts again "somewhere on the regimental line and ripped along in both directions. The level sheets of flame developed great clouds of smoke" (35). This narration contains a similar choice of words and descriptive patterns to the previous narration of the regiment firing, indicating that for most of the men the second fight is similar to the first-- but for others, like Henry, it is not-- because they cannot resume the collective "task" of fighting in the group. While most were again firing, Henry's eyes have a "look" of a "jaded horse" and his hands are too "large and awkward as if he was wearing invisible mittens. And there was a great uncertainty about his knee joints" (35). For the regiment it is "painful" to resume fighting,

but for Henry it is impossible.

No longer functioning as a member, he "waited in a sort of a horrified, listening attitude" waiting to be "gobbled" up by the "redoubtable dragons." As several men run, he soon follows them, with the delusion that it was "the regiment [that] was leaving him behind" (36). We soon find out that the line has held. After Henry returns to the regiment that night, he is told by Corporal Simpson that the company had lost forty-two men, but many were now showing up. Wilson comments the next morning: "Th' reg'ment lost over half th' men yestirday.... I thought 'a course they was all dead, but laws, they kep' a-comin' back last night until it seems, after all, we didn't lose but a few" (71). The regiment had held, with the support of the veteran regiments on each flank and later with the support of another reserve brigade (38), but with difficulty due to its large loss of men to desertion. Jim Conklin's prediction was a roughly accurate description of how the regiment would do on its first day.

> "Oh, there may be a few of 'em run, but there's them kind in every regiment, 'specially when they first goes under fire.... Of course they ain't never been under fire yet, and it ain't likely they'll lick the hull rebel army all-to-oncet the first time; but I think they'll fight better than some, if worse than others. That's the way I figger... the boys come of good stock, and most of 'em 'll fight like sin after they oncet git shootin'." (12-3)

Those individuals who were involved in the unit's task of fighting, who resumed the group effort in the second skirmish, stayed. Those, like Henry, who fled, could not yet identify their own safety with that of the group. They were not ready for the unselfish (and ultimately safer) sacrifice of immersion within the group identity. So in spite of his first experience, where he is "not a man but a member" and is "welded into a common personality" (30) for which he comes to feel the "bonds of tied hearts" (34), Henry has maintained his old illusions that individual action is more important than group cooperation. He rationalizes that it is "the duty of every little piece to rescue itself" on its own recognition of danger, for if he did not "then, where would be the army?" (39).

On the second day, the regiment, after some more seemingly purposeless moving around, ends up again defending against a Rebel attack. Henry begins to "fume with rage and exasperation" (78). The machine-like enemy "seemed never to grow weary." Henry "had a wild hate for the relentless foe. Yesterday, when he had imagined the universe to be against him, he had hated it, little gods and big gods" but "today he hated the army of the foe with the same great hatred" (79). Gregory Zilboorg's discussion of troop morale in World War Two, which is quoted in the article "From Rifleman to Flagbearer" by Kermit Vanderbilt and Daniel Weiss, can explain the significance of Henry's anger.

> It is a well-observed fact that 'green' troops become 'seasoned' as soon as they become angry-- that is, as soon as they begin to convert their fear of death into hatred and aggression.... It is the mechanism of revenge, of overcoming death by means of murder, that proves here too the most potent psychological force. (Vanderbilt 288)

While I am not sure that this is a "fact," it does chart the normal process that many soldiers progress through during their baptism of fire. Not only Henry, but much of the regiment has begun to feel the same angry rage against the enemy. "The regiment roared forth in sudden and valiant retort." The thick smoke "was furiously slit and slashed by the knifelike fire from the rifles" (79). To Henry, the other men around him "resembled animals tossed for a death struggle into a dark pit. There was a sensation that he and his fellows, at bay, were pushing back, always pushing fierce onslaughts of creatures" (79). The defending regiment now seems to be striking out at the enemy instead of only trying to keep them back, pushing back furiously against the intrusions. The regiment has taken a second important step in the road to becoming seasoned troops, but they will soon find out that attacking is even more difficult than defending.

In their first attack, the courage of the men and the leadership provided by Lt . Hasbrouck, Fleming and Wilson is not enough to overcome the enemy. At first, "the straining pace ate up the energies of the men" and with the loss of breath comes "a return to caution" (87). "The men stood, their rifles slack in their hands, and watched the regiment dwindle" (87). The lieutenant's roaring has no effect, but finally Wilson's "angry shot at

the persistent woods... awakened the men. They huddled no more like sheep" They fire, and start forward, "unevenly with many jolts and jerks" (88). The enemy is a "flaming opposition in their front [which] grew with their advance" until "all forward ways were barred." The "whole affair seemed incomprehensible to many of them" (88). When the color sergeant is killed, Henry and Wilson jump for the flag, and as Henry turns with it, he sees that "the regiment had crumbled away" and the "dejected remnant was coming slowly back" with their forces "expended" (90). The officers are finally able to "beat the mass into a proper circle to face the menaces" and when the smoke clears the lieutenant sees an advancing enemy force moving very close by. His warning is "lost in a roar of wicked thunder from the men's rifles." Henry's regiment is "intent with the despair of their circumstances and they seized upon the revenge to be had at close range. Their thunder swelled loud and valiant" (93). This successful little battle, when they were "on the verge of submission," had "showed" them that they could fight well (94).

> The impetus of enthusiasm was theirs again. They gazed about them with looks of uplifted pride, feeling new trust in the grim, always confident weapons in their hands. And they were men. (94)

Many critics read this "and they were men" as another example of the soldier's (indivdual and collective) propensity for self-delusion. I disagree. They must return to their lines, receiving the jeering abuse of the veterans for failure to reach their objective, but the statement reflects the emotional state of the unit. They have learned about the importance of unit cohesion and morale from their first attack, and their actions for the rest of the novel bear out their changed mental state. Their knowledge came at the end of the charge, and so they must be reminded by the veterans of their failures to achieve tangible results. But their subsequent actions indicate that their new feelings do reflect an accurate understanding and acceptance of the need for unified action in order to be successful. And in their next battle they indeed do "fight well."

When "a formidable line of the enemy came within dangerous range" the men "threw up their rifles and fired a plumping volley at the foes"; though "there had been no

order given, the men upon recognizing the menace, had immediately let drive their flock of bullets" (101). When the colonel comes running along the back of the line yelling, "We must charge'm!" there is no "rebellion against this plan" as the colonel anticipated. Surprisingly "they were giving quick and unqualified expressions of assent" and their bayonets give "an ominous, clanging overture to the charge" (102). The men recognize the military necessity to drive the enemy from the fence. To remain would be death, and to retreat would be to "exalt" those who had denigrated their new found confidence. "At the yelled words of command the soldiers sprang forward in eager leaps" (102). Henry's yelling from the front was "urging on those that did not need to be urged" for the men were "again grown suddenly wild with an enthusiasm of unselfishness" (103).

The "incredible selflessness" which Anderson says is "the highest virtue" in this kind of "infantry battle" (84) has now become the standard for Henry's regiment. The attack is successful. The enemy either "retired stubbornly" or were quickly killed or taken prisoner. The men now respond to their duties, not as individuals but unselfishly for the benefit of the unit. They have lost the illusions of war, they recognize the importance of the unit over the individual, and are better for their knowledge. They have taken the enemy regiment's flag, which is a significant achievement. The regiment has reason to be proud; they have become "seasoned" during the battle, they fought "better than some, if worse than others" and have gained invaluable experiences. Their final charge has proven that "they could fight well" and were now a valuable member in the Army of the Potomac. Probably, they will still get some good-natured harassment from the veterans, but their self-confidence will now allow them to take it in stride, proud of their achievements. While it is not realistic to expect one battle to make them fully matured veterans, they seem to be on the right path.

III

The development of the regiment, from a green untried unit to its beginnings as a veteran organization, is paralleled by the growth and maturity of its two major officers--new company commander Lieutenant Hasbrouck and regimental commander Colonel MacChesnay. Once again the context of these officer's experiences is inseparable from the regiment's common experience. How well the officers do is a reflection of how well the regiment is doing.

The first view of officers in the novel (both in general and of the two central ones) is a denunciation which is filtered by Henry's consciousness. When the army fails to move out promptly after Jim Conklin's prediction of a flanking campaign, Henry is in no way relieved, but "on the contrary," found the wait "an irritating prolongation" (13). He concludes that "the only way to prove himself was to go into the blaze, and then figuratively to watch his legs to discover their merits and faults" (14). As the days pass, the "great anxiety" in "his heart was continually clamoring at what he considered the intolerable slowness of the generals." Because "he wanted it settled forthwith" his "anger at the commanders reached an acute stage, and he grumbled about the camp like a veteran" (15). As already mentioned, the denunciation of field officers is a common characteristic of the Civil War personal narratives; in this case the denunciations reflect Henry's fear of cowardice and his desire to "settle" it
quickly, and is not a reasonable criticism of his chain of command.

Henry's anger only increses the closer the regiment gets to a fight. Early on the morning that his corps finally begins to move, Henry stands in ranks, watching the first glow of sunrise.

> In the gloom before the break of day their uniforms glowed a deep purple hue. From across the river the red eyes were still peering. In the eastern sky there was a yellow patch like a rug laid for the feet of the coming sun; and against it, black and patternlike, loomed the gigantic figure of the colonel on a gigantic horse. (15)

As he waits, Henry "grew impatient," finding it "unendurable the way these affairs were managed." He wonders "how long they were to be kept waiting" (15). The red fires of the enemy camp across the river seem to be the eyes of a monster, and he "conceived them to be growing larger, as the orbs of a row of dragons advancing." When he turns towards the colonel, he sees "him lift his gigantic arm and calmly stroke his mustache" (15). A rider gallops up to the colonel, there is a "short, sharp-worded conversation"; then as the new rider leaves, he calls out: "'Don't forget that box of cigars!'" Henry wonders "what a box of cigars had to do with war" (15). In this exchange, the simple act of the regiment waiting for its turn to take the road and a possible cigar wager becomes, in Henry's opinion, an instance of poor leadership. Henry sees in the colonel, as an authority figure, an obstacle to his getting his problem "settled forthwith." So the colonel is pictured "patternlike" as a "gigantic figure" on a "gigantic horse" who lifts "his gigantic arm" to "calmly stroke his mustache." For Henry's overactive imagination, the colonel becomes a sort of "gigantic" foe, blocking his path, who is "managing" this "affair" in such an "unendurable" way. The resentment resulting from his lack of control causes Henry naturally, but unfairly, to blame the authority figure-- who assumes a larger than life dimension. And a minor personal affair, over a box of cigars, becomes a symbol for the whole pattern of mismanagement that Henry accuses his chain of command of. This pattern of denunciation of his officers as a result of personal fears or private rationalization continues for most of the novel.

Several days later, Henry finds himself running down a road towards the sound of gunfire. He feels "inclosed" by the surrounded regiment; "he was in a moving box." He thinks he is being "dragged by the merciless government.... taking him out to be slaughtered" (21). While Henry is crossing some open fields, skirted by woods, "absurd

ideas took hold of him" (23). He sees the enemy in every shadow: "The swift thought came to him that the generals did not know what they were about. It was all a trap." As he considers his tragic condition and the stupidity of his officers, he lags behind. Lieutenant Hasbrouck begins to beat him "heartily" with the flat of his sword, talking to him in a "loud and insolent voice." Regaining ranks, Henry decides that he "hated the lieutenant who had no appreciation of fine minds. He was a mere brute" (23). Here Henry makes an immediate mental transfer from the incompetence of the generals to the lack of understanding of his company's officers.

Henry's denunciation of his officers is modulated by several other brief perspectives. After Henry complains about all the seemingly purposeless counter marching, the loud soldier Wilson agrees:

> "It ain't right. I tell you if anybody with any sense was a-runnin' this army it---"
> "Oh, shut up!" roared the tall private. "You little fool. You little damn' cuss. You ain't had that there coat and them pants on for six months, and yet you talk as if---" (25)

Conklin points out that privates seldom know the point or importance of any military movement. It can be frustrating to be constantly moving around, and never (seemingly) get to the fighting; and it is natural to blame the authority figures for it, but that alone does not make it legitimate criticism for inexperienced privates.

After returning over the same ground that afternoon, the brigade halts in the edge of a grove with the battle raging on the forward right flank. The narration at this point becomes a page long list of unattributed comments from the soldiers as they are waiting. Apparently, it represents what Henry is overhearing from the line of comrades, including: "That young Hasbrouck, he makes a good off'cer. He ain't afraid 'a nothin'" (27). For at least some of the men, Hasbrouck is not a "mere brute." This indicates that many of Henry's opinions can be considered suspect and should be taken ironically.

When the lieutenant is shot in the hand during this first skirmish:

> He began to swear so wondrously that a nervous laugh went along the regimental line. The officer's profanity sounded conventional. It relieved the tightened senses of the new men. It was as if he had hit his fingers with a tack hammer at home.
>
> He held the wounded member carefully away from his side so that the blood would not drip upon his trousers. (27-8)

When the company commander tries to help bind the wound, the two argue over "how the binding should be done" (28). The scene introduces the lieutenant's constant swearing and its role as a method of motivating and reassuring the men. It also shows his rather immature concern (considering the situation) over not soiling his uniform.

Colonel MacChesnay also acts poorly during this first skirmish. After "Saunder's" brigade is "crushed" (28) and driven in, to the jeering catcalls of the veteran regiments on either flank, there is the exchange between him and an angry general who rides up.

> A hatless general pulled his dripping horse to a stand near the colonel of the 304th. He shook his fist in the other's face. "You've got to hold 'em back!" he shouted, savagely; "you've got to hold 'em back!"
>
> In his agitation the colonel began to stammer. "A-all r-right, General, all right, by Gawd! We-we'll do our-- we-we'll d-d-do-- do our best, General." The general made a passionate gesture and galloped away. The colonel, perchance to relieve his feelings, began to scold like a wet parrot. The youth, turning swiftly to make sure that the rear was unmolested, saw the commander regarding his men in a highly resentful manner, as if he regretted above everything his association with them. (30)

Colonel MacChesnay identifies himself with the regiment, but not in a favorable light. He regrets the association, because he is anxious that they will not be able to hold against the enemy, and that he will be blamed for their failure.

As the attack reaches its crescendo, the officers are standing behind the firing line, "bobbing to and fro, roaring directions and encouragements. The dimensions of their howls were extraordinary. They expended their lungs with prodigal wills" (32). Lieutenant Hasbrouck stops one soldier who had "fled screaming at the first volley."

> The man was blubbering and staring with sheeplike eyes at the lieutenant, who had seized him by the collar and was pommeling him. He drove him back into the ranks with many blows. The soldier went mechanically, dully, with his animal-like eyes upon the officer. Perhaps there was to him a divinity expressed in the voice of the other-- stern, hard, with no reflection of fear in it. He tried to reload his gun, but his shaking hands prevented. The lieutenant was obliged to assist him. (32)

For this soldier at least, the lieutenant might have some "divinity in his voice" so "stern" and "hard," without any "reflection of fear in it." This "little isolated scene" foreshadows the unsuccessful attempt that Hasbrouck will make to keep Henry from fleeing the next skirmish, in just a few minutes. But Henry will certainly not recognize any "divinity" in the voice of this "mere brute." The scene suggests that there are other perspectives of the lieutenant (and of battle fear) than Henry's. That other soldiers do not blame the officers to the same extent as Henry, helps to modulate our view of them. It is also important in light of the growing connection that will be made between Henry and Hasbrouck on the second day of the fighting.

After Henry flees the firing line, he feels "wronged" (39) when he discovers that the line has held. He "grew bitter over" the "blind ignorance and stupidity of those little pieces," his comrades, who "had withstood the blows and won" (39). Temporarily, Henry transfers his anger at the officers to his comrades. "A dull, animal-like rebellion against his fellows, war in the abstract, and fate grew within him" (40). Later, during his self rationalization, he hopes that the army will lose the battle, in order to vindicate his decision to run. He felt "no compunctions for proposing a general as a sacrifice.... could center no direct sympathy" (56) for him. He felt "it would be very unfortunate... but in this case a general was of no consequence to the youth" because a defeat "would be a roundabout vindication of himself" (57). At this point, Henry's denunciation of officers reflects his own agitated mental condition and his isolation from his chain of command more than it is a reasonable discussion of their leadership shortcomings in combat.

Henry's acceptance of his mistake in running, necessitated by his return that night to the regiment, does not break him of his blaming the generals for all of the army's (and his own) problems. The next morning, he boldly says: "'B'jiminey, we're generaled by a lot 'a lunkheads.'" He is unable to "restrain himself" from "a long and intricate denunciation of the commander of the forces" (75). Though he is "secretly dumfounded"

when this "sentiment... came from his lips," and he looks around "guiltily," he cannot stop.

> "Well, then, if we fight like the devil an' don't ever whip, it must be the general's fault," said the youth grandly and decisively. "And I don't see any sense in fighting and fighting and fighting, yet always losing through some derned old lunkhead of a general."
>
> A sarcastic man who was tramping at the youth's side, then spoke lazily. "Mebbe yeh think yeh fit th' hull battle yestirday, Fleming," he remarked. (76)

This "speech pierced the youth," the "chance words" reducing "him to an abject pulp." For a brief time he becomes a "modest person" (76). Although Henry recognizes that his tirade is foolish, he cannot stop. It is either self rationalization or an attempt to hide his own regretful behavior on the day before.

As he gains experience, Lieutenant Hasbrouck becomes an increasing effective leader. While the unit waits for the next attack, the Hasbrouck "strode to and fro with dark dignity in the rear of his men" (77). He acts quickly to suppress rumors and unnecessary talk that might hurt morale.

> "You boys shut right up! There no need 'a your wastin' your breath in long-winded arguments about this an' that an' th' other. You've been jawin' like a lot 'a old hens. All you've got t' do is to fight, an' you'll get plenty 'a that t' do in about ten minutes. Less talkin' an' more fightin' is what's best for you boys. I never saw sech gabbling jackasses."
>
> He paused, ready to pounce upon any man who might have the temerity to reply. No words being said, he resumed his dignified pacing. (78)

Though he is in a dark mood, the lieutenant is doing the right thing by silencing these demoralizing and eventually superfluous comments. Too much talking about a bad situation can only hurt morale and make the situation worse. During the skirmish that Henry ran from, "the words that comrades had uttered previously to the firing began to recur to him.... "What do they take us for-- why don't they send supports? I didn't come here to fight the hull damned rebel army" (35-6). It is very possible that the echoing of these demoralizing and exaggerated opinions is what drove Henry (and others) to flee. In fact an entire brigade was quickly being sent in their support, and there were veteran regiments on both of their flanks to help fight off the brief attack. But these undenied

comments become part of an intricate and deluded system of logic which overwhelms the youth. This time the lieutenant curtly dismisses rumors of mismanagement, and even offers a seemingly simple solution (fighting a little harder) to their problem. The phrase "dignified pacing" is difficult to attribute-- to the narrator or to Henry-- but in either case it reflects a growing admiration for the lieutenant.

In the next skirmish, Henry fights in an animal-like battle rage--firing long after the enemy has withdrawn. Henry is complimented by the lieutenant, who calls him a "wildcat," (81) and wishes he had more fighters like him. From now on there is a growing "association" between Henry and Lieutenant Hasbrouck, who "always unconsciously addressed himself to the youth" whenever "he had a particularly profound thought upon the science of war" (81).

By this point the characteristic officer denunciation has shifted to a slightly higher, more impersonal level. In a natural process of human integration, Henry (and apparently many others) no longer blames those officers that he knows and sees, but shifts his comments to higher and more faceless authorities. During the lull, Fleming and Wilson go on an unsuccessful search for water. Returning, they overhear the division commander ordering their new "cowboy riding" brigade commander to launch a spoiling attack against the enemy.

> "What troops can you spare?"
>
> The officer who rode like a cowboy reflected for an instant. "Well," he said, "I had to order in th' 12th to help th' 76th, an' I ha' en't really got any. But there's th' 304th. They fight like a lot 'a mule drivers. I can spare them best of any." (84)

The brigade commander smiles when, as he starts to leave, the general calls out in a sober voice: "'I don't believe many of your mule drivers will get back'" (84). Henry is startled to "learn suddenly that he was very insignificant," for the officer had spoken of the regiment as if it were a "broom" and in a "tone properly indifferent to its fate." For Henry "it was war, no doubt, but it appeared strange" (84). Much of Fleming's motivation and

anger during the attack will be aimed at some sort of vindication to this "cowboy" officer.

As the regiment gets ready to charge, Fleming and Wilson look at each other.

> They were the only ones who possessed an inner knowledge. "Mule drivers-- hell t' pay-- don't believe many will get back." It was an ironical secret. Still, they saw no hesitation in each other's faces, and they nodded a mute and unprotesting assent when a shaggy man near them said in a meek voice: "We'll git swallowed." (85)

This is a telling point for both Fleming and Wilson. Both are very willing to attack in spite of their knowledge of the attack's poor probability of success. Whether it is pride, anger, or concern for each's opinion of the other, this willingness seems to mark them as more seasoned than green.

The officers quickly get the men "into a more compact mass and into better alignment," chasing "those that straggled" like "critical shepherds struggling with sheep" (85). When the attack falters from exhaustion and fear, the roaring of the lieutenant rises "above the sounds of outside commotion.... his infantile features black with rage":

> "Come on, yeh fools!" he bellowed. "Come on! Yeh can't stay here. Yeh must come on." He said more, but much of it could not be understood.
> He started rapidly forward, with his head turned towards the men. "Come on," he was shouting. The men stared with blank and yokel-like eyes at him. He was obliged to halt and retrace his steps. He stood then with his back to the enemy and delivered gigantic curses into the faces of the men. His body vibrated from the weight and force of his imprecations. He could string oaths with the facility of a maiden who strings beads. (87-8)

The lieutenant seems to be one of the major motivating factors for the whole regiment. He is certainly following the primary dictum of infantry leadership: "Follow me!" At each halting stop, he tries "coaxing, berating, and bedamning." Once again he associates with Henry, grabbing his arm: "'Come on! We'll all git killed if we stay here. We've only got t' go across that lot.'" With "unspeakable indignation" Henry shakes him off, then: "'Come on yerself then,' he yells, with a "bitter challenge in his voice" (88-9). As they "galloped together down the regimental front" first the flag and then the "dilapidated regiment surged forward" (89). But when the color bearer is hit, and Fleming and Wilson wrestle over the flag, the attack stops and "crumbled away." The yelling of the officers

reaches a crescendo: "There was a melee of screeches, in which the men were ordered to do conflicting and impossible things" (90). At this point the officers have lost control, and in the confusion of trying to get the men going forward again, their incoherent yelling only serves to confuse the situation. The regiment is simply not cohesive enough yet to continue such a difficult mission.

Most of the regiment falls back to a line of trees:

> However, the rear of the regiment was fringed with men, who continued to shoot irritably at the advancing foes. They seemed resolved to make every trouble. The youthful lieutenant was perhaps the last man in the disordered mass. His forgotten back was towards the enemy. He had been shot in the arm. It hung traight and rigid. Occasionally he would cease to remember it, and be about to emphasize an oath with a sweeping gesture. The multiplied pain caused him to swear with incredible power. (91)

This is an important juxtaposition. The first time that Hasbrouck is wounded (in the hand) he holds it away from him, trying to keep the blood off of his uniform. Then he argues with the captain about how to dress it. But now, his more seriously wounded arm hangs forgotten at his side, so concerned is he with the unit, and with getting the soldiers to do the right thing. It is a juxtaposition of initially personal concerns with the eventually more mature group considerations which come to totally overshadow his personal ones. It is the movement from private to unit considerations. He has immersed himself in the group effort, and his individual selflessness has become his "greatest virtue."

As the attack fails, Henry, recognizing that he will not have his revenge on the Brigadier for the "mule drivers" label, "wrapped his heart in the cloak of his pride and kept the flag erect" (91). With the lieutenant he "harangued his fellows":

> Between him and the lieutenant, scolding and near to losing his mind with rage, there was felt a subtle fellowship and equality. They supported each other in all manner of hoarse, howling protests. (91)

Henry has now identified with the unit's officers, particularly with Lieutenant Hasbrouck. They have become, in a sense, partners.

As the regiment stops, "the officers labored like politicians to beat the mass into a proper circle to face the menaces" (92). Just then the temporarily silent lieutenant bawls out: "'Here they come! Right onto us, b'Gawd!'" (93). An advancing enemy force, not knowing that the regiment is there, has chanced into their position. With only the warning shout, and with encouragement unnecessary, the blue regiment lashes out with all of its pent-up rage at this vulnerable enemy; "they seized upon the revenge to be had at close range" (93). When the enemy is driven off, many have "an ungainly dance of joy" at their successful skirmish, which showed they were not "impotent" and that the "impetus of enthusiasm was theirs again" (94).

Through the jeering of the veteran regiments, they return to their original lines. Immediately the "cowboy" riding brigade commander reigns in sharply next to Colonel MacChesnay and "exploded in reproaches which came unbidden to the ears of the men" who were "always curious about black words between officers":

> "Oh, thunder, MacChesnay, what an awful bull you made of this thing!" began the officer. He attempted low tones, but his indignation caused certain of the men to learn the sense of his words. "What an awful mess you made! Good Lord, man, you stopped about a hundred feet this side of a very pretty success! If your men had gone a hundred feet farther you would have made a great charge, but as it is--what a lot of mud diggers you've got anyway!" (96)

The colonel straightens out and puts forward one hand in "oratorical fashion." Wearing an "injured air" he seemed like a deacon "accused of stealing."

> But all of a sudden the colonel's manner changed from that of a deacon to that of a Frenchman. He shrugged his shoulders. "Oh, well, general, we went as far as we could," he said calmly.
>
> "'As far as you could?' Did you, b'Gawd?" snorted the other. "Well, that wasn't very far, was it?" he added, with a glance of cold contempt into the other's eyes. Not very far, I think. You were intended to make a diversion in favor of Whiterside. How well you succeeded your own ears can now tell you." (96)

The lieutenant, in an "impotent rage," comments to the colonel,"in firm and undaunted tones":

> "I don't care what a man is-- whether he is a general or what-- if he says th' boys didn't put up a good fight out there he's a damned fool."
>
> "Lieutenant," began the colonel severely, "this is my own affair, and I'll trouble you--"
>
> The lieutenant made an obedient gesture. "All right, colonel, all right," he said. He sat down with an air of being content with himself. (96)

This scene is very different from the last time that Colonel MacChesnay was angrily addressed by a general officer. The first time, when savagely told: "you've got to hold 'em back!" MacChesnay had stammered in his agitation. He had regarded "his men in a highly resentful manner," as if he "regretted" his "association" with them (30). MacChesnay no longer regrets this association with his regiment. He starts to reply with a deacon's oration--the injured air of an improperly accused thief--but instead explains calmly that they did as well as they could. From our knowledge of the conversation between division and brigade commanders, and since the brigade commander says that they were only a "hundred feet short" of "very pretty success," we can infer that the regiment has done as well as, if not better than, the brigade commander expected when he labeled them expendable "mule drivers." The brigade commander is clearly upset--but perhaps this is disappointment that they came so close to success, rather than any original expectation that they would succeed when he selected them for the attack.

When Lieutenant Hasbrouck tries to offer encouragement to the Colonel about the general's criticism, MacChesnay makes a wonderful reply, to butt out, since "this is my own affair." He accepts the complete responsibility for the failure-- he does not pass it down to the men, regretting his association with them. He simply, calmly, and effectively takes responsibility for everything his unit does or fails to do, without complaint or attempt at extenuation. The acceptance of full responsibility is one of the highest traits that a good commander can have. It encourages and protects the unit from unnecessary or unfair criticism. It is a lesson the new brigade commander could take a page from--by keeping his temper and never correcting a subordinate in front of his men. The economy of this scene makes it a remarkable description of moral courage and military professionalism. Its

effectiveness rests on the brevity and the sharpness of images juxtaposed: the stammering, regretful colonel from the day before; the immature and unprofessional "cowboy" riding brigade commander; and the calm and responsible regimental commander of that day.

During the next and final skirmish of the novel, the lieutenant, returning from a bandage search, "produced from a hidden receptacle of his mind new and portentous oaths suited to the emergency" until it "was evident that his previous efforts had in nowise impaired his resources" (100-1). Then a large body of the enemy attacks and seizes a good position of fence line opposite the regiment and begins to "slice" them up. Although the regiment quickly volleys without waiting for a superfluous word of command, the more exposed blue "regiment bled extravagantly." Henry looks first at Wilson, then at his lieutenant:

> The lieutenant, also, was unscathed in his position at the rear. He had continued to curse, but it was now with the air of a man who was using his last box of oaths.
>
> For the fire of the regiment had began to wane and drip. The robust voice, that had come strangely from thin ranks, was growing rapidly weak. (102)

This is a critical moment. The lieutenant has exhausted his primary leadership tool-- new and exciting oaths-- and like the rest of the regiment is at the end of his rope. "The men recalled the fact that they had been named mud diggers, and it made their situation thrice bitter" (101). Now, with even the most aggressive officer down to "using his last box of oaths," it appears that the "rejoicing body of the enemy" will be successful. But then:

> The colonel came running along back of the line. There were other officers following him. "We must charge 'm!" they shouted. "We must charge 'm!" they cried with resentful voices, as if anticipating a rebellion against this plan by the men. (102)

Henry (and the officers) expect resistance from the soldiers to an attack, but he "perceived with a certain surprise that they were giving quick and unqualified expressions of assent." Recognizing, as Henry does, that it "would be death to stay," their only "hope was to push the galling foes away from the fence." With a "new and unexpected force in the movement of the regiment," they attack into the "fierce rifles of [the] enemy" (102-3) and

scatter them. At the critical point of the battle, when the exhausted leaders are unable to do anything more, it is the regiment's newest self-confident leader, Colonel MacChesnay, who turns the tide from defeat to victory for the volunteers of the 304th. In a remarkable culmination of maturation under conditions of fearful combat, the once stuttering regimental commander makes the decision to attack. It is an action which completes the regiment's journey from the ranks of the untried to those of the tested. [11]

Hasbrouck also has a final positive accolade, an accolade which Henry now accepts. As they march back towards the river, the men were "plodding in ragged array, discussing with quick tongues the accomplishments of the late battle." One snatch of overheard conversation (completing a sort of circle) is about the "mere brute lieutenant: "Hasbrouck? He's th' best off'cer in this here reg'ment. He's a whale'" (108). Henry has come to agree with the unidentified speaker about Hasbrouck's good points. Henry's growing association with Hasbrouck has led him to both praise of and identification with the lieutenant, and the unit he represents. Although Hasbrouck does not undergo the same dramatic maturation process as that of MacChesnay, his immersion in the collective welfare marks him as an important figure in the unit's journey to self realization on the hot forge of battle.

Stephen Crane has provided the novel with a structural pattern within which an individual private experiences battle. The use of military units as a framework within which Henry develops-- particularly the regiment of which he is a member-- serves an important guide to his progression. The regiment is depicted as growing from an inexperienced mob of volunteers to a well run and seasoned military organization with professional and competent officers. The importance of an organization to the individual private is obvious, the experience of individuals in battle being inseparable from their context. The regiment and the private reflect significantly upon each other. Just as the regiment has taught Henry about the importance of immersion into the group effort, so has

Henry inspired his comrades. Edwin Cady, in his book Stephen Crane, explains how the "realist" writers "saw life as a continuum of personal experiences" where the writer "broke in upon its flow at one significant point and left it at another" (141). Cady believes that at the end Henry is "neither a hero nor a villain" but has to "assume the burdens of a mixed, embattled, impermanent, modest, yet prevailing humanity" (142). Ralph Ellison, in Shadow and Act, writes that "although Henry has been initiated into the battle of life, he has by no means finished with illusion-- but that, too, is part of the human condition" (Pizer "Guide to Criticism" 154). Like the regiment, Henry will have other experiences, he has gained much, but his experience is not yet complete. A couple of days, even as full as these have been, cannot make him a complete man. His progression has had its share of illusions and delusions, and he will probably have a few more in the future, but his growing maturity will stand him in good stead. It seems unlikely that he will flee again in terror before the "gray coats" like the "startled rabbits, squirrels, and quail." He is now a member of Conrad's "tried body of men" who are "matured in achievement" and who are conscious of its "worth" (192). The 304th New York is clearly a better organization, and Henry's experiences with it are proof that he is better too.

Notes

[1] The now well accepted conclusion that Crane used the battle of Chancellorsville for the setting of the novel is conclusively argued by Harold Hungerford, in "'That Was at Chancellorsville': The Factual Framework of The Red Badge of Courage." He discusses Crane's use of The Battles and Leaders of the Civil War series as a source for technical information. Frederick Crews' edition of the novel even provides maps and textual notes for the references and allusions in the novel to the actual Chancellorsville campaign. Hungerford argues that Henry receives his wound from one of the Union soldiers who were fleeing Jackson's surprise attack.

[2] Since the 1960's, it seems to me that most of The Red Badge criticism has centered on finding the portrayal of Henry ironic and (often, by analogue, man in general) consistently self-deluded. An important part of this thesis has been the attack on the traditional 1895 Appleton edition by Hershel Parker and his former students, Henry Binder and Steven Mailloux, who want to replace this, what they call "maimed text," with the "original form" from an almost complete Crane manuscript. This "original" text, according to them, is less ambiguous on the issue of Henry's development, making it "clearly ironic." The controversy is complicated, but deals with an incomplete manuscript that Crane used to make revisions. The problem is that a number of passages not deleted in the manuscript, do not appear in the Appleton edition. It is possible that these deletions were made by Crane at a later date, in a later manuscript, or on gallery sheets; or that an Appleton editor, such as Ripley Hitchcock, made them or forced Crane to accept them. Parker and company believe that Appleton was responsible for the changes, and feel therefore that the "original" manuscript most closely represents Crane's final intention for the novel. In any case there has been strong dissension about this replacement of the Appleton text. Many critics feel that this "original" manuscript is an important critical resource, but not a replacement text unless more substantial proof that Crane did not make the changes can be found. The essays which argue for replacement of the 1895 Appleton edition are: Henry Binder, "The Red Badge of Courage that Nobody Knows"; Steven Mailloux, "The Red Badge of Courage and Interpretive Conventions; Critical Response to a Maimed Text"; and Hershel Parker, "Getting Used to the 'Original Form' of The Red Badge of Courage." Many of the major critics considered this manuscript during their research over the years, and saw it as a stage in the novel's development. Robert Stallman's Stephen Crane: An Omnibus, and Edwin Cady's Stephen Crane, both provide detailed discussions of the textual problems in a context prior to the current debate. Olov Fryckstedt's article and Joseph Katz in his Introduction to the facsimile edition to the novel argue, with Stallman and Cady, that the deletions were made by Crane and were beneficial to the novel. J.C. Levenson's Introduction to the Virginia Edition presents the fullest discussion of the revisions and excisions of the novel. Finally, I agree with Donald Pizer's essay "The Red Badge of Courage Nobody Knows': A Brief Rejoinder" which argues that the Appleton text is authoritative, and is not incoherent as Binder and others believe. (Pizer has since been joined by Wortham, Covici and Dunn in this position of arguing for the coherence of the "traditional" text.)

3 For a good discussion of the problem of Crane's relationship to Henry Fleming at the close of the novel see Donald Pizer's bibliographic article in the Norton Critical Edition of the novel (Bradley). He has an updated essay, "Stephen Crane: A Review of Scholarship and Criticism since 1969," which covers from 1969 to 1975 (and some 1976-77 items). Pizer identifies that a major difficulty is Crane's use of irony. Here, it seems to me, it is a question of the traditional acceptance of Henry's estimate of himself as a man versus the newer school which holds that the ending is another ironic depiction of his (Henry's or man's in general) ability for "self-delusion." Another school believes that Crane's characterization of Henry is "consciously or unconsciously ambivalent" (Pizer 152). Critics like Charles Walcutt argue that the novel is a "study of man's ability to delude himself under any circumstances" (153). On the other hand, R.W. Stallman believes that "Henry undergoes a sacramental experience" through the "redemptive experience" offered by Jim Conklin's death, and that The Red Badge is representative of a novel of initiation and maturity into manhood (Pizer 153). Other, naturalistic, critics such as James Cox and Marston LaFrance argue that "Henry progresses from a romantic vision of the world to an awareness that man lives in a hostile and godless universe" (154). Many scholars are very concerned with the ambiguity of the ending of the novel. John Berryman, Mordecai Marcus, and James Colvert argue that "Crane could not make up his mind... or was deluded," and often cite the conclusion as "flawed" (Pizer 155).

4 Critical studies of the influence of European writers on Crane's work are very ambitious. The primary one that links Crane with Tolstoy and Zola is Lars Ahnebrink's The Beginnings of Naturalism in American Fiction, 1891-1903 (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1950) Rpt (New York: Russell & Russell, 1961). James Colvert points out in his essay "Stephen Crane" in American Realists and Naturalists Volume 12 of the Dictionary of Literary Biography, which will be referred to subsequently as "DLB," that Crane had read Tolstoy's novel about the Crimean war, and while at Lafayette College in 1890 had ventured to say that Tolstoy was the "world's greatest writer" (102). Colvert continues:

> During this time [1891-2] he was also working out a theory of art, evidently basing it partly on theories of realism advanced by Hamlin Garland and William Dean Howells, partly on ideas expressed by the realist painter-hero of Kipling's novel The Light that Failed (1891), and partly on the practical demonstration of the uses of irony and the handling of psychological realism in Tolstoy's Sebastopol. (102)

Also useful to this paper is V. S. Pritchett's The Living Novel (New York, 1947), which argues that the European war novels had a general influence on Crane, and did not provide a specific source. More recently, J.C. Levenson in his introduction to the second volume of the Virginia Edition, expands Ahnebrink's thesis, that Tolstoy's Sebastopol is a "major source." [See also note 10 for a separate discussion of Homeric influences on The Red Badge.]

5 This list of similarities is drawn from Webster, but is supplemented by both Stanley Wertheim's "The Red Badge of Courage and Personal Narratives of the Civil War." American Literary Realism 1870-1910. 6.1 (Winter 1973): page 61, and DLB pages 108-10.

6 The most important proposals for sources from Civil war novels are: H.T. Webster's essay "Wilbur Hinman's Corporal Si Klegg and Stephen Crane's The Red Badge of Courage"; Thomas F. O'Donnell's "De Forest, Van Petten, and Stephen Crane" which links Crane with John William De Forest's Miss Ravenel's Conversion from Secession to Loyalty (1867) and Crane's teacher at Claverack military school (General Van Petten, who was a veteran of Chancellorsville). Robert Stallman's Stephen Crane: An Omnibus also discusses Van Petten; Eric Solomon's essay "Another Analogue for The Red Badge of Courage" links it to Joseph Kirkland's The Captain of Company K; Alexander Tamke's essay "The Principal Source of Stephen Crane's Red Badge of Courage" tries unsuccessfully to demonstrate that Kirkland's novel is not only an analogue, but the major source for Crane's war novel. Ambrose Bierce's Tales of Soldiers and Civilians (1891) also has very realistic battle scenes. Eric Solomon's chapter "A Definition of the War Novel" in Stephen Crane: From Parody to Realism offers a good summary of the discussion of the "realistic" Civil War novels by Kirkland, De Forest, and Bierce.

7 Wertheim's most important examples are: Alonzo F. Hill's Our Boys (1864), John Billings' Hardtack and Coffee (1888), Warren Lee Goss' Recollections of a Private: The Story of the Army of the Potomac (1890), and Frank Wilkerson's Recollections of a Private Soldier in the Army of the Potomac (1887) which "Howells considered one of the best books ever written about the Civil War" (63).

8 The list of elements from personal narratives is primarily from DLB 108 page 108-10, but I added to it from Wertheim's article (61-2).

9 There are four important discussions of Homeric parallels in Stephen Crane's work: The best is Warren D. Anderson, "Homer and Stephen Crane," Nineteenth Century Fiction 19.1 (June 1964): 77-86. A second is Robert Dusenberg, "The Homeric Mood in The Red Badge of Courage," Pacific Coast Philology 3 (April 1968): 31-7. Chester L. Wolford's The Anger of Stephen Crane: Fiction and the Epic Tradition (Lincoln: Univ of Nebraska P, 1983) is a complex book length study. And finally N.E. Dunn, "The Common Man's Iliad," Comparative Literature Studies 21.3 (1984): 270-81. Wolford offers a good review of the Homeric parallels on page xi-x. Also see Dunn, page 272, for a summary of the tremendous range of differences between the conclusions reached in each work.

10 For example, more than a century of military excellence in battle drill helped to provide the German States with unprecedented success from the time of Frederick II (the Great) to Chancellor Bismark's overrunning of the Austrian Empire in only seven weeks in 1866. For a discussion of the issue of the importance of drill in battle, and in Germany in particular, see the Dupuy brothers: On page 610 they discuss Frederick's debt to Gustavus Adolfus and on 611 Frederick's use of close order drill. For some of his individual battles see 643-4 and 668-78. Other useful references to Frederick are on pages 664 and 678. For a discussion of Helmuth von Moltke's brilliant campaigns in the Austrian-Prussian and Franco-Prussian wars see 830-37. Major John English's book On Infantry also offers some insightful comments on the later German tradition under von Moltke on pages 2-4 and 143-6.

[11] This scene also echoes in an interesting way a regimental charge of the 20th Maine on the Little Round Top at Gettysburg, which makes a quiet, introverted professor of rhetoric and religion at Bowdoin College a national hero and eventually one of the most beloved governors of Maine. Told to hold at all costs, Joshua Chamberlain commands the last unit in the line at the critical Little Round Top on the second day. Surrounded on three sides by attacking Confederate regiments, bent at an unbelievable angle, and ammunition exhausted by numerous attacks, Joshua Chamberlain orders an attack which sweeps off the hill, crushes the Confederate attack and routs Longstreet's entire right flank. It is the most unexpected and celebrated event of the entire battle at Gettysburg. While the 304th New York's charge can hardly be compared to the 20th Maine's, it is interestingly similar and unexpected. The best description of Chamberlain's battle is in the Pulitzer Prize winning novel Killer Angels, by Michael Shaara (New York: Ballantine, 1974).

Works Cited

Anderson, Warren. "Homer and Stephen Crane." Nineteenth Century Fiction 19.1 (1964): 77-86.

Bradley, Sculley, et la., eds. The Red Badge of Courage: An Authoritative Text. By Stephen Crane. 2nd eds. New York: Norton, 1976.

Cady, Edwin. Stephen Crane. Twayne's United States Authors Series 23. New York: Twayne Publ, 1962.

Colvert, James. "Origins of Stephen Crane's Literary Creed" University of Texas Studies in English. 34 (1955): 179-88. Rpt in Bradley 131-40.

___. "Stephen Crane." American Realists and Naturalists. Ed. Donald Pizer. Dictionary of Literary Biography, 12. Detroit: Gale, 1982.

Conrad, Joseph. "His War Book: A Preface to Stephen Crane's The Red Badge of Courage." Last Essays. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1926. 119-24. Rpt. in Bradley 190-4.

Crane, Stephen. The Red Badge of Courage: Authoritative Text. Ed Bradley, Sculley, et la. A Norton Critical Edition. 2nd ed. New York: Norton, 1976.

Pizer, Donald. "Stephen Crane." Fifteen American Authors Before 1900. Ed. Robert Rees and Earl Harbert. Madison: Univ of Wisconsin Press, 1971. 111-27. Rpt as "Crane and The Red Badge of Courage: A Guide to Criticism." Bradley 143-56.

___. "Stephen Crane: A Review of Scholarship and Criticism since 1969." Studies in the Novel. This is in a special Stephen Crane edition of the magazine. 10.1 (1978): 120-45.

Vanderbilt, Kermit, and Daniel Weiss. "From Rifleman to Flagbearer." Modern Fiction Studies 11 (Winter 1965-66): 371-80. Rpt in Bradley 285-93.

Webster, H.T. "Wilbur F. Hinman's Corporal Si Klegg and Stephen Crane's The Red Badge of Courage." American Literature 11.3 (Nov 1939): 285-93.

Wertheim, Stanley. "The Red Badge of Courage and Personal Narratives of the Civil War." American Literary Realism 1870-1910. 6.1 (Winter 1973): 61-5.

Selected List of Works Consulted

Aaron, Daniel. The Unwritten War: American Writers and the Civil War. New York, 1973.

Bassan, Maurice. Stephen Crane: A Collection of Critical Essays. Twentieth Century Views. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice, 1967.

Berryman, John. "Crane's Art." Stephen Crane. New York: William Sloan, 1950. Rpt in Bassan 27-51.

Binder, Henry. "The Red Badge of Courage that Nobody Knows." Studies in the Novel 10.1 (1978): 9-47.

Breslin, Paul. "Courage and Convention: The Red Badge of Courage." The Yale Review 66 (1976): 209-22.

Brooke-Rose, Christine. "Ill Logics of Irony." Mitchell, New Essays 129-146.

Burhans, Clinton. "Twin Lights on Henry Fleming: Structural Parallels in The Red Badge of Courage." Arizona Quarterly 30.2 (1974): 149-59.

Cather, Willa. "When I Knew Stephen Crane." The Library 1 (June 1900). Rpt in Bassan 12-17.

Colvert, James. Introduction. Stephen Crane: Tales of War. By Stephen Crane. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1969. Vol. 6 of The Works of Stephen Crane. Ed Fredson Bowers. 10 vols. 1969-76. xi-xxxvi.

Crane, Stephen. "The Price of the Harness." Gullason 507-20.

___. "The Second Generation." Gullason 636-52.

___. "The Upturned Face." Gullason 689-91.

___. "Virtue in War." Gullason 614-24.

Delbanco, Andrew. "The American Stephen Crane: The Context of The Red Badge of Courage." Mitchell, New Essays 49-76.

Dunn, N.E.. "The Common Man's Iliad." Comparative Literature Studies 21.3 (1984): 270-81.

Fryckstedt, Olov "Henry Fleming's Tupenny Fury: Cosmic Pessimism in The Red Badge of Courage." Studia Neophilologica 33 (1961): 265-81. Rpt under the subtitle in Bassan 141-45.

Gollin, Rita. "Little Souls Who Thirst for Fight in The Red Badge of Courage." Arizona Quarterly 30.2 (1974): 111-18.

Greenfield, Stanley. "The Unmistakable Stephen Crane." PLMA 73 (1958): 562-72. Rpt in Bradley 222-32.

Gullason, Thomas. ed. The Complete Short Stories and Sketches of Stephen Crane. Garden City, N.J.: Doubleday, 1963. "Introduction" 19-45.

___. "The Permanence of Stephen Crane." Studies in the Novel 10.1 (1978): 86-95.

Horsford, Howard. "'He Was a Man.'" Mitchell, New Essays 109-128.

Hungerford, Harold. "'That Was at Chancellorsville': The Factual Framework of The Red Badge of Courage." American Literature 34 (Jan 1963): 520-31. Rpt in Bradley 157-66.

Johnson, George. "Stephen Crane's Metaphor of Decorum." PMLA 78 (June 1963): 250-6. Rpt in Bassan 67-79.

Kaplan, Amy. "The Spectacle of War in Crane's Revision of History." Mitchell, New Essays 77-108.

Katz, Joseph, ed. Introduction The Red Badge of Courage. The Portable Stephen Crane. by Stephen Crane. New York: Penguin, 1969.

Krauth, Leland. "Heroes and Heroics: Stephen Crane's Moral Imperative." South Dakota Review. 11 (Summer 73): 86-93.

Kwiatt, Joseph. "Stephen Crane's Literary Theory: 'The Effort Born of Pain.'" American Studies 24 (1979): 152-6.

LaFrance, Marston. A Reading of Stephen Crane. Oxford: Clarendon, 1971.

Mailloux, Steven. "The Red Badge of Courage and Interpretive Conventions: Critical Response to a Maimed Text." Studies in the Novel 10.1 (1978): 48-63.

Marcus, Mordecai. "The Unity of The Red Badge of Courage." The Red Badge of Courage: Text and Criticism. Ed. Richard Lettis et la. New York: Harcourt, 1960. 189-95. Rpt in Bradley 233-40.

Mitchell, Lee Clark. ""Naturalism and the Languages of Determinism." Columbia Literary History of the United States. Ed. Emory Elliot. New York:Columbia UP, 1988, 523-45.

___. Ed. New Essays on The Red Badge of Courage. The American Novel Series. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1986.

O'Donnell, Thomas. "DeForest, Van Petten, and Stephen Crane." American Literature (Jan 1956).

Parker, Hershel. "Getting Used to the "Original Form" of The Red Badge of Courage." Mitchell, New Essays 25-48.

Perosa, Sergio. "Naturalism and Impressionism in Stephen Crane's Fiction." Annali di Ca' Foscari 3 (1964): 119-42. Rpt in Bassan 80-94.

Pizer, Donald. Realism and Naturalism in Nineteenth-Century American Literature. Crosscurrents Modern Critiques Series. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1966

"A Primer of Fictional Aesthetics." College English. 3 (April 1969): 572-80.

"The Red Badge of Courage: Text, Theme, and Form." South Atlantic Quarterly 84 (1985): 302-13.

"The Red Badge of Courage Nobody Knows': A Brief Rejoinder." Studies in the Novel 11 (1979): 77-81

Rechnitz, Robert. "Depersonalization and the Dream in The Red Badge of Courage." Studies in the Novel 6 (Spring 1974): 76-87. Rpt in Bradley 349-60.

Reynolds, Kirk. "The Red Badge of Courage: Private Henry's Mind as Sole Point of View." South Atlantic Review 52.1 (1987): 59-69.

Sadler, Frank. "Crane's 'Fleming': Appellation for Coward or Hero?" American Literature 48 (1976): 372-6.

Solomon, Eric. Stephen Crane: From Parody to Realism. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1967.

"Another Analogue for The Red Badge of Courage." Nineteenth Century Fiction, 13 (June 1958): 63-7.

Spiller, Robert. "Towards Naturalism in Fiction." Literary History of the United States. Ed. Robert Spiller et la. 3rd ed. New York: Macmillan, 1963, 1016-38.

Stallman, Robert. "Introduction." Stephen Crane: an Omnibus. New York: Knopf, 1961, 175-224

"Notes toward an Analysis of The Red Badge of Courage." Bassan 128-40.

Van Meter, Jan. "Sex and War in The Red Badge of Courage: Cultural Themes and Literary Criticism." Genre 7 (1974): 71-90.

Walcutt, Charles. American Literary Naturalism, a Divided Stream. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1956.

Wolford, Chester. The Anger of Stephen Crane: Fiction and the Epic Tradition. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1983.

Young, Philip. "Crane and Hemingway." Ernest Hemingway. New York: Holt, 1952. Rpt in Bassan 52-6.

VITA

Timothy John Brotherton

[redacted] Nominated to the United States Military Academy from Riverdale High School in Fort Myers, Florida. Graduated in May 1981, and commissioned a second lieutenant in the US Infantry. Following assignments as platoon leader, operations staff officer, and company executive officer at Fort Stewart Georgia, and the Basic and Advanced infantry officer's courses at Fort Benning, reported to the National Training Center in the Mojave desert as a member of the Opposing Force. After commanding the 2nd Guards Battalion (Bravo 1-52 Inf) for almost two years, was selected as a potential instructor for the English Department at West Point, and sent to the College of William and Mary under a two year advanced degree program. Awards include: Jump wings, Ranger tab, Expert Infantry badge, and the Meritorious Service Medal. Will begin teaching composition at the Military Academy in August 1990, to the Plebe class of the Corps of Cadets.